

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS

Claim 4, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly indefinite, has been canceled, obviating the rejection.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,644,364 to Kurtze.

Claims 6, 9, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,364 to Kurtze in view of well known prior art.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein the picture element components A and the picture element components B comprise a luminance component Y and one of two color difference components, and wherein the one of two color difference components is selected as a function of a sampling frequency.” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicant, U.S. Patent No. 5,644,364 to Kurtze (hereinafter, merely “Kurtze”) relates to providing a media pipeline with two channels for processing sequences of digital still pictures.

Applicant submits that nothing has been found in Kurtze that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicant submits that Kurtze fails to teach or suggest that the picture element components A and the picture element components B comprise a luminance component Y and one of two color difference components, and that the one of two color difference components is selected as a function of a sampling frequency, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 7, which recites similar features, is also believed to be allowable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons.

Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800